

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed November 8, 2005 objected to claim 47 for missing pluralities; rejected claims 47-50, 56-64, and 70-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,835,758 to Nochur et al. (November 10, 1998) (*Nochur*); and rejected claims 51-55, 65-69, and 79-81 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nochur*.

By this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 47-81 and added new claims 82-117. No new matter has been added.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Amsbury for the courtesy and consideration extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interview conducted on March 28, 2006. These remarks are consistent with topics discussed during the teleconference.

Regarding the objection to claim 47 for missing pluralities, by this Amendment, claim 47 has been cancelled rendering the objection moot.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 47-50, 56-64, and 70-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). By this Amendment, claims 47-50, 56-64, and 70-78 have been cancelled rendering the Section 102 rejection of claims 47-50, 56-64, and 70-78 moot.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 51-55, 65-69, and 79-81 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). By this Amendment, claims 51-55, 65-69, and 79-81 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the Section 103 rejection of claims 51-55, 65-69, and 79-81 moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims 82-117 are in a condition for allowance for at least the reason that *Nochur* does not teach or suggest every claim element. For example, independent claim 82 recites a series of method steps including, among other things, “defining one or more consistency rules, each of the one or more consistency rules including at least one condition and associated with at least one pointer identifying a portion of a structured electronic document...” *Nochur* does not teach or suggest at least defining one or more consistency rules, each of the one or more consistency rules including at least one condition and associated with at least one pointer identifying a portion of a structured electronic document.

For at least the reasons set forth above, claims 82-117 should be allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of claims 82-117.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action contains numerous assertions concerning the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether those assertions are addressed specifically herein, Applicants respectfully decline to automatically subscribe to them.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 25, 2006

By: 

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743